



Sustainable migration in the context of development

Report of a high-level meeting convened in Brussels on 29 November 2016

Context and process

The high-level meeting reported on was proposed as an initiative of the Slovak Presidency of the EU Council, in collaboration with UNESCO's intergovernmental science programme on the Management of Social Transformations (MOST). Its purpose was to consider the nexus between migration and development from the perspective of research in the social and human sciences in order to enhance the knowledge base available for policy design and implementation at EU level.

By focusing on how to bring about *sustainable* migration, the meeting complemented other initiatives at EU and UN levels to address the sustainable management of large-scale movements of persons, particularly in emergency situations, and the social consequences of migration in receiving countries. In order to ensure a comprehensive and up-to-date perspective on the available knowledge base, the meeting was prepared *inter alia* by the work of an ad hoc expert group, which reported on its findings on the basis of a one-day meeting held in Brussels on 28 November 2016.

The meeting was based on a partnership approach, including the perspectives of non-EU countries, in particular in Africa, as well as expertise and institutional competence within European institutions and the UN system, in particular through the contributions of the International Organization for Migration.

Other speakers included Slovak Republic's Ambassador at large responsible for Migration Igor Slobodník, Vladimír Šucha, Director-General of the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission, representatives from the European Commission (DG Development and Cooperation and DG Research) as well as the Agence française du développement.

In line with the 2030 Development Agenda, the international community and EU member states have agreed to adopt a transnational human rights-based approach in addressing migration and development challenges. In doing so, policy makers have renewed their commitment to rely on available scientific knowledge to inform policy design and implementation, with a view to ensuring the protection of all people on the move or subject to pressures to move.

The Brussels meeting echoed the points made on migration by the European Commission's proposal for a new European Consensus on Development¹ which states very clearly: "*Migration is a complex, global, long-lasting phenomenon requiring a carefully-designed, balanced, evidence-based and sustainable policy response*" (§56) and adds "*Poorly managed migration can create*

¹ COM(2016) 740 final.

major challenges and impact negatively on countries of origin, transit and destination, on the migrants themselves and on communities where they transit or settle.” (§57)

In addition to its direct policy relevance, the present EU-level discussion was designed to feed into the initiative that the MOST Programme has been asked by its Intergovernmental Council to set up on migration and development, in Europe and worldwide, in order to build more effective policies, guaranteeing the fundamental rights of everyone, everywhere. Interregional dialogue on migration and development will enhance EU policy reflection in a context of global migration dynamics.

The MOST initiative will further develop through consultation and dialogue with academics, policy-makers and civil society; and is on the agenda of the Intergovernmental Council session in Malaysia (16-17 March 2017). Representatives of EU member states and EU institutions who participated in the meeting welcomed the initiative and encouraged further cooperation and partnerships on the migration and development nexus.

The six conclusions presented hereafter are drawn from the discussions of the high-level meeting. This report does not purport to cover all relevant aspects of the migration and development nexus and rather focuses on priority topics. Some of the aspects developed in this report were not discussed in detail during the meeting and have therefore been complemented. A separate analytical document reviewing the academic knowledge base and policy practices in relation to migration and development and offering a more systematic justification for the arguments summarized in this report will be published in January 2017.²

Migration as a cross cutting issue calls into question traditional institutions competencies and traditional ways of producing and capitalizing on knowledge. Sustainably managing migration will imply managing the politics of migration just as much as the migration flows themselves.

The high-level meeting pointed to six main conclusions

1. **There is no single problem called migration.** Migration needs to be addressed as a complex set of issues, some of which, in certain circumstances, give rise to problems. A positive approach to migration means addressing these problems and their causes.

Migration as a social phenomenon is as much of a construct as it is a practical challenge. While political discussions in 2015 focused on how to cope operationally with the flow of migrants to Europe, 2016 debates have shifted to structural changes proposed by the EU's long-term strategy. However, the need to establish more clearly and more practically who needs international protection has been raised as one of the major gaps. In particular, the meeting underlined that the question of burden sharing and solidarity remains unsettled.

It is common knowledge among academics and policy makers that the root causes of migration, migration regimes, and post-migration processes (or their absence), connect very closely to one another. However, participants criticized the current fragmentation of the migration agenda into separate segments. In this context, the main challenge for political and practitioner communities

² In particular, references to the academic and policy literature in support of the points made will be provided in this analytical document.

is to capture the complex phenomenon as a whole, while addressing effectively its different components. Policies with such objectives can be recognized as *effective* and *integrated* to the extent they guarantee the fundamental rights of everyone, everywhere.

Furthermore, the discussions acknowledged that rhetorical framing has huge impacts on both political discourses and policies. Migration and refugee issues are often depicted in the mainstream media as an “urgent crisis”, and referred to by terms such as “floods” or “mass influx”, with visual representations that may be deliberately spectacular. In addition, more extreme statements are strongly present in public debate, in particular through the role of social media. By contrast, based on the extensive available research literature, academic experts encourage depicting migration as a part of a globalized and complex society, in which the political focus lies both on ensuring the rights of people and maximising the positive impacts of migration on development in countries of origin, transit and destination. This is entirely consistent with the thrust of the proposed European Consensus on Development, as quoted above, which defines the problem not as “migration” in general – assuming that such a thing even exists – but as “poorly managed migration”, which necessarily implies the possibility of “well-managed migration”.

For this reason, and in order to approach migration in an integrated manner, there is a need to better involve all stakeholders, from the public and private sectors. It was argued that “working together” will allow the promotion of an alternative language of public debate about migration, emphasizing specific problems that can be addressed. For example, as presented by the speakers, the European Commission’s Migration Research Platform, which encompasses activities under the Framework Programme on Migration and Mobility, aims to inform, consult and mobilise a wide range of internal and external stakeholders.

In developing further global research on the migration and development nexus, specific attention should be given to moving beyond an EU-centric approach. It was strongly emphasized that research results tend to counter assumptions common in public debate, driven by the politicization of migration discourse, providing evidence that most migrants are not in fact moving from the “global South” to the “global North”. While South-North is the migration pathway that shows the fastest increase in use, and while the EU is still the single most sought after destination in the world, such flows contribute to less than half of global migration (around 40 per cent). Meanwhile, a similar number of people have migrated within the global South – 37 per cent. Intra-North migration accounts for 19 per cent, and North-South for 4 per cent of the total. To these figures must be added 740 million internal migrants. It was thus judged important for analytical purposes to recognize that the term “migration” serves as much to obscure the differences between disparate patterns of human movement as it does to highlight their broad family resemblance.

Further research should also allow for a better contextualization of what is currently depicted as the “migration crisis”, with a view to identifying potential continuity and/or differences in migration patterns by comparing the current flows with previous migration waves.

Such approach also implies addressing effectively migration as a “system of systems”, which calls for an improved division of labour. In particular, the work of the Research and Evidence Facility (REF) was presented. The purpose of this consortium of research organisations working for the EU Trust Fund is to stand as a knowledge partner of the Fund, with a view to collating and producing evidence and policy relevant knowledge to inform targeted interventions addressing instability, irregular migration or forced displacement. Its findings will be widely disseminated with a view to reaching as many stakeholders as possible.

Because the nature of migration flows is mixed, different groups have different needs and thus fall under different protection frameworks. Populations on the move include: labour migrants (regular and irregular), smuggled migrants, trafficked persons, unaccompanied and separated children, environmental migrants, as well as refugees, asylum-seekers, and individuals seeking family reunification. People's reasons for moving are diverse and intertwined and may change along their journey and over time. Policies addressing the complex issue of migration will thus need to do so through different dynamics. There is no single legal framework of asylum that enables addressing migration as a whole – such an approach would in fact undermine the asylum management system. Family reunification needs to be addressed through the human rights lens, beyond a short-term political choice in favour or against it. In this perspective, and as underlined in the discussions, political responses need to be differentiated depending on the type of migration. A “layered” approach and appropriate language will favour the inclusion of all groups, in line with the 2030 Development Agenda.

Making these distinctions between different dynamics is a key feature of a *positive* approach to migration, as it moves beyond the false idea of migration as one single problem and seeks to understand the different issues (and in certain circumstances *problems*) arising from migration flows. Separating “migration” into its different aspects and designing different policies to address these aspects is already in itself *positive*. The direct policy implications of such an approach will be discussed in section 5.

2. **Migration policies should not be reactive responses to yesterday’s issues.** To enable future-oriented migration policy thinking, a strong emphasis on foresight is required, in particular with respect to factors such as demography, technological change and natural resources.

Participants in the meeting drew attention on the importance of better understanding the determinants of migration as well as how they interact with one another. This implies understanding the evolution and transformation of migration flows over time, with a view not to overemphasizing politically framed priorities that may refer to *past challenges*. Designing anticipatory policies calls for improved research, including reflection on a “rapid reaction” tool, based on more flexible and rapid identification of emerging challenges and policy requirements, with a stronger involvement of policy makers along the process.

As one of the existing tools for evaluation and foresight, the Migration Governance Index was presented: it considers various theories, forms of migration and characteristics of countries to model root causes. The work of the Knowledge Centre on Migration and Demography (KCMD) was also introduced to the audience. With regard to demography, research conducted by the Centre aims in particular to collect critical data to fill the knowledge gap on demographic trends in certain areas of the world. Such collected information makes it possible to sketch scenarios on the structural transformations of populations: one example is to the ratio between workers and retired persons. Another example provided during the discussions was the current and future needs of different labour sectors. It is already observed that the computer programming sector is increasingly using computers for a large part of its activities. On the contrary, the need for human labour in the care giving and medical sectors is expected to remain stable.

Likely European demographic changes were among the issues most often mentioned in the discussions. It is now common knowledge that a lower birth-rate and longer life expectancy have

led to profound transformations in the composition of the European population, impacting welfare, social care and labour supply in different sectors. One major difficulty in building scenarios on future European demographics lies in integrating migration flows. While labour migration flows are one of the most “stable” patterns of migration (and therefore rather easily foreseen), “extraordinary” migration linked to conflict, natural disasters and other geopolitical shocks remains, on the contrary, largely unpredictable. For this reason, such events constitute one of the biggest foresight challenges with respect to demographic trends in Europe.

Furthermore, in this regard, comparative analysis across European countries will be key in understanding context-specific demographic trends. Indeed, those disparities produce major challenges in building common management of migration flows at the European level. Experts have called for common action on immigration management and integration based on the political acknowledgment of immigration as a *necessary driving force* of population growth in European countries.

Further research is also needed on the interlinkages between the different drivers of migration and displacement: integrating geopolitical shocks into the analysis of migration may shed light on the differentiated impact of natural disasters or conflict on migration flows.

Developing future-oriented migration policy thinking also calls for a development cooperation approach based on capacity-building. It was suggested to build a network of existing foresight initiatives within the EU and UN institutions, in particular to support foresight capacities in developing countries. Moving away from operational planning towards strategic anticipatory thinking implies creating the conditions to implement a *desirable* future, relying on creativity and collective action.

3. Reducing *vulnerability* is crucial to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda as a whole.

Addressing the causes of vulnerability in a comprehensive manner, taking account of related issues such as poverty, conflict or resource scarcity, will have positive impacts on development, while transforming the nature of migration flows.

In relation to foresight, an important issue raised during the discussions on vulnerability was the risks associated to involuntary immobility. The phrase “trapped population” was used during the discussions and refers to individuals or families that are too poor to leave their home or to relocate in areas where they are no longer exposed to risks. This is an aspect of the system-modeling approach in which migration and displacement are analyzed from the viewpoint of socio-ecosystem resilience. In particular, it recognizes migration as an adaptation strategy that allows diversifying livelihoods. In this perspective, further research on the social, economic and environmental aspects of human settlements (at the individual and community levels) would enable the design of anticipatory measures to cope with natural disasters or environmental stresses. Combining this comprehensive contextual analysis with robust data should allow practitioners to identify what erodes peoples’ capacity to cope and ways to intervene in order to reduce displacement risk. In this regard, the displaced themselves have an important role to play in ensuring the veracity, reliance and legitimacy of this data. They can point to drivers beyond the precipitating trigger when explaining why they fled.

The discussions also addressed the complex relationship between environmental pressures, conflict and migration. In particular, beyond the identification of migration drivers (slow onset

pressures) or triggers (events), a knowledge gap was identified with regard to the distance, direction and duration of migration, overlooked by the driver/trigger lens.

All in all, research is needed in order to design coping strategies that improve or strengthen the resilience of communities, in particular with vulnerable population and ecosystems.

Going beyond prejudices and limited understanding of migration will also imply acknowledging in policy-making the academic consensus that, while migration is in general terms adaptive, people may nonetheless sometimes migrate towards (and not away from) risk. The example of climate change was provided during the discussions, highlighting that evidence shows that people move from rural areas, in response for example to resource scarcity, to big coastal cities exposed to different kinds of risks.

Moreover, there is also an academic consensus that development at least initially fosters migration by increasing people's capacity and aspiration to migrate. In line with this idea and the SDG's transversal approach to sustainable development, addressing vulnerability is also a way to transform the nature of migration flows: increasing labour migration and making it more manageable, while attempting to decrease refugee and other emergency flows. In this perspective, increasing available resources would also shift migration towards *choices* rather than pressures. Development cooperation should not aim to contain migration but rather, to alleviate humanitarian pressures and privilege design issues with respect to the administrative-legal management of regular migration.

However, it appeared important to note that there are "migration dependency paths" that are not driven only by development but also by other forces such as social networks and mismatches between expectations and observable social outcomes. The general point that development changes the nature of migration flows should therefore be used carefully and in reference to specific contexts.

4. **Remittances are a key aspect of the nexus between migration and development.** Financial flows are just one aspect of remittances, which also include circulation of political, social and cultural ideas and practices. The development benefits of remittances depend on the absorption capacities of beneficiary groups.

Several research projects funded by the EU were presented in order to highlight some of their conclusions on the migration and development nexus. In particular, it has been observed that emigration can potentially lead to development in the country of origin through the transfer of remittances, the mobilization of diaspora communities and return migration. In this respect, participants in the meeting called for an improved mobilization of diasporas, including through migrants' associations, investments in local infrastructures or engagement in local associations in countries of origin.

One of the main observations on remittances is the need to approach them more holistically, considering "social, political and cultural" remittances. Such remittances include ideas, norms and values, as well as social capital. The transfer of "ideas on democratization" from European destination countries to countries of origin is one illustration of this phenomenon, on which there is some research, but perhaps not enough.

Furthermore, discussants considered the complexity of return strategies and the need for academics and policy-makers to better understand them in order to maximize their benefits for origin and destination countries. In particular, improved knowledge on return strategies would provide critical information for policy-makers on the policies that best support and encourage the transfer of remittances. Academics have called for further comparative research, including cross-national comparisons, with a particular and rigorous attention to sample choice.

In addressing significant research gaps with respect to non-financial aspects of remittances and the diversity of contexts, one other major challenge will be how to best develop the “ability” for migrants to acquire capital. In this perspective, the role of education (both formal and informal through observation) need to be better understood.

Remittances may be positive or negative: the questions of “where? how? why? when?” also need to be addressed. In particular, research has shown that there are understudied challenges arising from the attempt of transferring social remittances. The social and human sciences may shed light on the “translation” processes of new behaviours, values or ideas into origin country contexts. Better understanding the circumstances in which migrants acquire new capital and how remittances (social, economic, political, cultural) can best be invested in countries of origin is a necessary step to foster development through migration. Among the factors that may hamper this positive migration-development nexus are the lack of basic infrastructure and inadequate “opportunity structures”, such as weak anti-corruption rules or a climate unfriendly to investment.

Finally, speakers drew the attention to the idea that remittances may also be a source of social innovation. Recent EU initiatives acknowledge and intend to build on the link between migration and social innovation. However, such an approach mostly covers the specific needs and challenges of receiving countries. Migration was depicted in the discussions as both a *consequence* and a *cause* of social change. Therefore, beyond the causal relationship between migration and development, “opportunity structures” need to be improved for people to be agents of change. Like new migration patterns, remittances are not a one-directional process, but *circular*.

5. **The benefits of migration can best be attained through frameworks of legal migration to the EU, including with respect to labour migration.** Establishing such frameworks clashes with the current parameters of public and policy debate.

It is widely recognized that in an appropriate context and appropriately managed, migration may bring positive benefits to countries of origin, transit and destination. In this perspective, and given that the aforementioned policy objectives have yet to be achieved, the question is how to create such positive conditions.

Research has shown convincingly that restrictive policies (border controls and border security) fail to contain migration and generate new risks of movement, including by increasing its costs. Such risks arise from exposure to smugglers and traffickers, which should be addressed as an effect rather than a cause of irregular migration. On the contrary, as noted above, the evidence reviewed during the meeting on the impact of development on migration shows very clearly that development tends to accelerate migration, and particularly migration flows of skilled labour, by offering more available means, more opportunities, more knowledge, leading to higher aspirations for potential migrants.

Furthermore, restrictive migration policies are observed to decrease the incentives for return migration, as immigrants tend to feel trapped in the destination country and are therefore reluctant to take more risks by crossing borders more than once. In this perspective, policies that aim to favour or encourage return migration may need to focus on regularizing the situation of migrants in order to offer the best environment possible for them to move back and forth safely and freely between countries of origin, transit and destination.

Speakers expressed their concerns about the general perception that the EU is trying to prevent migration flows to Europe. This perception is due to political discourses and policies that further encourage restrictive migration policies in Europe, disregarding scientific evidence. In relation to this, a restrictive policy approach to migration also reveals a tendency not to address today's migration crisis – there are thus much more forcibly displaced persons in Africa than in Europe - but rather to attempt to prevent a potential future migration crisis in Europe.

An excessively short-term approach leads to overemphasis on rapid and reactive measures that produce immediate and visible outcomes. Restrictions on migration are one illustration of the neglect of long-term projects and go against policies in favour of integration or development cooperation.

In this regard, some of speakers sounded a note of caution about the still prevailing “conditionality” approach, and encouraged moving away from development cooperation that is not exclusively used for genuine development purposes. One way to improve this situation would be, precisely, to emphasize more strongly the generally positive impacts of migration in Europe in responding to public concerns.

On a more positive note, information was provided about various European Commission initiatives that support the integration of refugees in receiving countries in particular in the fields of education and training. Science4Refugee, for example, is an initiative that aims at matching the scientific education background of migrants and asylum seekers with vacancies in research institutes or universities in Europe (through internships or jobs). The project is accessible to refugees and institutions through the EURAXESS - Researchers in Motion portal. Beyond better integration of people on the move into receiving societies, the initiative aims to foster international cooperation and collaboration in the field of scientific research. Further common action is needed towards a more flexible and comprehensive system of skills transfer (including skills, qualifications and experiences that need to be better recognised in host societies). Alleviating such administrative or cultural barriers will help avoid what is now known as “brain waste”, by capitalizing and maximizing the potential of migrants and refugees.

The European “cultural divide” was also raised as one of the current challenges for policy-making on migration at the European level. Research clearly points to sharply differentiated attitudes towards migration, with low levels of trust in politics – themselves associated with socio-economic factors such as education – being correlated with opposition to immigration. This cultural divide makes migration a sensitive and difficult issue to manage. In this perspective, an improved understanding of European asylum systems and their potential evolution towards a common European legal framework, based on socio-historical research, could be relevant.

Experts and other panellists strongly encouraged action to ensure that relevant research on these issues is effectively disseminated in particular to policy makers, in order to favour better-informed debate on migration policy options.

Thus, as developed in section 1 above, there is a need to restate the *objective* of migration and development policies: specifically, to assert that development cooperation should serve to reduce migration flows of individuals in dangerous or vulnerable situations.

6. **The conditions for research-informed evidence to be taken up by policy makers can be considerably improved.** To do so, structured dialogues need to be established at both EU and global level.

Speakers underlined the challenge of bringing together the fragmented literature on policy-making in the fields of migration and development in enhancing the research-policy nexus. It was suggested that there is a “knowledge overload” needs to be filtered through centralized knowledge management mechanisms. The Knowledge Centre for Migration and Demography was created to address this challenge, with a view to providing policy makers and the EU member states with authoritative source of knowledge.

Furthermore, as already discussed in section 2, the participants raised the issue of differentiated cultures as one major obstacle in linking research and policy-making. For example, academic researchers and policy-makers often operate on different time scales. There was however a consensus in the debates that data and research remain key and indispensable to policy-making. Academic knowledge makes it possible to contextualize the causes and dynamics of migration flows and to provide critical knowledge on the impacts of migration. Furthermore, in response to short-term approaches, data and knowledge also enable the deconstruction of myths and populist narratives about both the determinants of migration and its impacts on different societies. In the long run, research can play a key role in the conceptual and theoretical framing of political debates.

In particular, participants in the meeting encouraged the development of better insight into the drivers of policy-making and EU cooperation under the Common European Asylum System and of participation in the Schengen Agreement. The political, social and historical factors that shape national decision-making barriers to developing an EU common system as well as the political, operational and legal complexities associated with the Schengen agreement should be better analysed. These points underline the extent to which understanding of the root causes of migration cannot be divorced from consideration of the logic and effects of migration regimes.

Further research and discussions focusing on how to best disseminate key research findings in an accessible manner, by encouraging more policy briefs for example, were also strongly encouraged for the design of future initiatives.

Particular attention was also given to data-related challenges in the improvement of the research-policy nexus. Participants in the meeting called for an enhanced evidence base on migration in certain areas of the world. In particular, the lack of up-to-date relevant data in Africa was judged to lead to poor management and policy-making. Migration data collection was indicated in the discussions to be one of the key levers for capacity building. In this context, it was suggested that further data collection initiatives could involve:

1. Longitudinal studies (from sending to receiving countries) based on a mixed method approach: quantitative/qualitative and multi-sited. Such research would allow mapping processes.

2. Improved research on evaluation of migration processes, choices and paths, considering that migrants act in the large part outside institutional frameworks. One illustrative proposition was to create a platform to reference good practices and initiatives based on brief evaluation templates – in dialogue with stakeholders.
3. The development of migration foresight research capacities at national level as developed in section 2.

Proposed action points

In light of the conclusions of the high-level meeting as summarized above, it appears that further collaboration should first focus on how best to disseminate the conclusions to expert networks with a view to integrating them into new projects within the framework of e.g. the EU Horizon 2020 2018-2020 Work Programme and other existing initiatives.

Furthermore, the conclusions call for strengthened collaboration between UNESCO, EU and UN institutions for specific context-based research and policy implementation, in line with the partners' objectives and strategy. Such collaboration may take the form of the joint organization of events or the joint production of publications.

Research initiatives aiming to enhance the knowledge base need to be complemented by improving the structure of the research-policy nexus, giving civil society and migrants groups a voice in the dialogue. This creates significant challenges for research design, which can be addressed through the kind of multi-stakeholder cooperation proposed above.

At the level of the MOST Programme, the conclusions of the high-level meeting will be integrated into the strategic framework and implementation mechanisms. This is an opportunity to address the migration and development nexus in a larger context, such as through the 10th Global Forum for Migration and Development to be held in June 2017.

Building on the discussions and expert recommendations, efforts should be made to take forward and develop the initiative at the EU level, through the good offices of the Slovak presidency, and in partnership with the Maltese and Estonian presidencies in 2017.

Annexes

Programme of the high-level meeting, 29 November, Brussels

Video message from UNESCO Director-General Irina Bokova (10:00-10:05)

Introductory speech (10:05-10:30)

Igor Slobodník, Ambassador at large responsible for migration, Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs of the Slovak Republic

Vladimír Šucha, Director-General of the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission

Migration and Development nexus in light of a research-informed policy (10:30-11:45)

John Crowley, Chief of Section - Research, Policy and Foresight, UNESCO

Hans Stausboll, Head of Unit, Development Coordination East Africa and Regional Cooperation in Eastern and Southern Africa, DG DEVCO, European Commission

Geertrui Lanneau, Senior Regional Labour Migration and Human Development Specialist, IOM Brussels

Jean-François Arnal, Head of Agence Française de Développement Representation to the EU

Discussion, Q&As

Follow-up and projects of future cooperation on long term objectives (Agenda 2030) (12:20-13:30)

Andrew Geddes, Director of the Migration Policy Centre, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute, Florence (from January 2017)

Izabela Grabowska, Centre of Migration Research, University of Warsaw

Elisabeth Lipiatou, Head of Unit Open and Inclusive Societies, DG Research, European Commission

Discussion, Q&As

13:30 – 15:00 Buffet Lunch

Participants in the expert meeting, 28 November, Brussels

UNESCO and EU representatives

John Crowley, Chief of section Research, Policy and Foresight, Social and human sciences sector, UNESCO

Jan Debisschop, Programme Specialist, UNESCO Liaison Office Brussels

Eve El Chehaly, Consultant, Social and human sciences sector, UNESCO

Paolo Fontani, Director of Liaison Office in Brussels and Representative to the European Institutions at UNESCO

Efrem Garlando, Program Assistant, UNESCO Liaison Office and Representation to the European Institutions

Raffaella Greco Tonegutti, Migration Policy Officer B6 - Open and Inclusive Societies-, Directorate General for Research & Innovation, European Commission

H.E. Ms. Klára Novotná, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of the Slovak Republic to UNESCO

Anna Schmidt, Specialist, B3 – Migration, Employment, Inequalities, Directorate General for Development and Cooperation, European Commission

Experts

Speranta Dumitru (Université Paris Descartes, France)

Papa Demba Fall (Université Cheikh Anta Diop, Sénégal)

Theodoros Fouskas (Centre of Migration Research, Greece)

Andrew Geddes (European University Institute, Italy)

Izabela Grabowska (University of Warsaw, Poland)

Russell King (University of Sussex, UK)

Aija Lulle (University of Sussex, UK)

Marco Martiniello (Université de Liège, Belgium)

Ronald J. Pohoryles (ICCR Foundation, Austria)

Liza Schuster (City University of London, UK)

Catherine Wihtol de Wenden (CERI, France)